

No. 9(1)-81-8Lab./3914/9.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. M. Khanna and Company, 14/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 8 of 1981

between

SHRI PARAM HANS, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. M. KHANNA AND COMPANY, 14/7, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present:—Workman in person.

Shri Manohar Lal, for the respondent management.

#### AWARD

This reference No. 8 of 1981 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/176—80/65176, dated 26th December, 1980 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Param Hans, workman, and the management of M/s. M. Khanna and Company, 14/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Param Hans was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

After receiving this reference notices were sent to both the parties, who appeared and stated that they have compromised the dispute. Their statements were also recorded. The workman Shri Param Hans stated that he had compromised the dispute with the respondent management. According to settlement Ex. M. 1, he had received Rs. 1,973/- in full and final settlement for his all claim and dispute including his right of reinstatement/re-employment. He further stated that now nothing remained due towards the management. This statement of the workman was also agreed to by the partner of the firm Shri Manohar Lal. He further stated that the workman was paid Rs. 1,973/- as per settlement Ex. M. 1.

In the view of statement made by the parties. I hold that the demand raised by the workman against the respondent management leading to this reference, has been duly satisfied. There is now no dispute remains to be adjudicated between the parties.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated 23rd February, 1981.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 460, dated 25th February, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the award may please be sent to this court within week's time.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)-81-8Lab./3914/10.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s M. Khanna and Company, 14/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad;—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 12 of 1981

between

SHRI BAIJ NATH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S M. KHANNA AND COMPANY, 14/7, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Non for the workman.

Shri Manohar Lal Partner and Shri H. L. Kapoor for the respondent management.

## AWARD

This reference No. 11 of 1981 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/176-80/65219, dated 26th December, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Baij Nath, workman and the management of M/s M. Khanna and Company, 14/7, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of the workman Shri Baij Nath was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference notices were sent to both the parties for 11th February, 1981. But none appeared from the side of the workman. Service of the notice was effected on the workman. It was 1.30 p.m. The case was called thrice. So I proceeded *ex parte* against the workman and the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the management for 12th February, 1981.

On 12th February, 1981 the *ex parte* evidence of the management was present and recorded. Shri Monohar Lal, partner of the respondent appeared as M.W. 1, who stated that the workman had settled his dispute with the respondent management. The copy of the settlement is Ex. M. 1. According to the settlement the workman was paid Rs. 600/- in full and final settlement of all his claim and dispute including his right of reinstatement/re-employment. He further stated that now nothing remained due towards the workman. The receipt of the voucher is Exhibit M. 2 and prayed that award be given accordingly.

In view of the on rebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management. I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absention of the workman, in the proceedings of the reference in this court. I feel that the workman had settled his dispute with the respondent management and now there is no dispute between the parties. No order as to costs.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated, the 23rd February, 1981.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 459, dated 25th February, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-8Lab/3914/11.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Oswal Engineering and General Works, Industrial Area, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 16 of 1981

Between

SHRI DARSHAN LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M'S. OSWAL ENGINEERING AND GENERAL WORKS, 48, INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD

Present.—

None for the workman.

Shri Satish Ahuja for the respondent management.

## AWARD

This reference No. 16 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/196-80/65164, dated 26th December, 1980 under section 10(1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Darshan Lal, workman and the management of M/s. Oswal Engineering and General Works, 48, Industrial Area, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Darshan Lal, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference notices were sent to both the parties, for 10th February, 1981, but none was present from the side of the workman. The notice was served on the workman I waited upto 1.30 p.m. and proceeded *ex parte* against the workman. Then the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the management for 11th February, 1981.

On 11th February, 1981 Shri Satish Ahuja appeared on behalf of the management and stated that the workman had been taken back on duty from 16th December, 1980 as per settlement Ex. M. 1. He further stated that the workman was still working with the respondent management and nothing was due towards the management.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absention of the workman, in the proceedings of the reference. I feel that the workman had settled his dispute as per Ex. M. 1. Therefore, I give my award that there is now no dispute between the parties. No orders as to costs.

This be read in answer to this reference.

The 23rd February, 1981.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 458, dated 25th February, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)-81-8Lab/3914 12.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Oswal Engineering and General Works, 48, Industrial Area, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 15 of 1981

between

SHRI BUDH SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M.S OSWAL ENGINEERING AND GENERAL WORKS 48, INDUSTRIAL AREA FARIDABAD

Present :—

None, for the workman.

Shri Satish Ahuja, for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference No. 15 of 1981 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/ED/197-80/65158, dated 26th December, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute between Shri Budh Singh workman and the management of M/s. Oswal Engineering and General Works, 48, Industrial Area, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Budh Singh was justified and in order ? If not to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference notices were sent to both the parties for 10th February, 1981, but none was present from the side of the workman although the notice was served on the workman. I waited upto 1.30 P. M. and proceeded *ex parte* against the workman. Then the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the management for 11th February, 1981.

On 11th February, 1981 *ex parte* evidence of the management was recorded. Shri Satish Ahuja appeared as MW-1, who stated that the management had taken back the workman on duty as per settlement Ex. M-1. He further stated that the workman was still working with the respondent-management and nothing was due towards the workman.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absention of the workman in the proceedings of this reference. I feel that the workman has settled his dispute as per Ex. M-1. Therefore, I give my award that there is now no dispute between the parties. No order as to costs.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated, the 23rd February, 1981.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 457, dated 25th February, 1981

Forwarded (Four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)-81-gLab/3914-13.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sono Electricals Pvt. Ltd. Sector 24, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY PRESIDING OFFICER LABOUR COURT HARYANA FARIDABAD

Reference No. 559 of 1980

between

SHRI VED PARKASH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SONO ELECTRICALS, PVT. LTD., SECTOR 24, FARIDABAD

Present.—

None, for the workman.

Shri Viney Bansal, Manager and Shri G. K. Verma for the respondent.

#### AWARD

This reference No. 559 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana.—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/146/80/60119, dated 15th December, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ved Parkash, workman and the management of M/s. Sono Electricals, Pvt. Ltd., Sector 24, Faridabad. The terms of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ved Parkash was justified and in order ? If not to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to both the parties, for 28th January, 1981, on which date both the parties appeared and the workman prayed for a date for filing the claim statement, which was granted and the case was fixed for 3rd February, 1981 for filing the claim statement. On 3rd February, 1981 the workman stated that his demand notice be treated as claim statement. Then the case was fixed for filing the written statement for 10th February, 1981, but on that date of hearing none appeared on behalf of the workman. I waited upto 1.30 P.M. and proceeded *ex parte* against the workman. Then the case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the management for 11th February, 1981.

On 11th February, 1981 the *ex parte* evidence of the management was recorded. Shri Vinay Bansal Manager, appeared as MW-1, who stated that the workman Shri Ved Parkash was employed in the respondent management as a learner at a salary of Rs. 225 per mensem. Photostat copy of the appointment letter is Ex. M-1. He further stated that the work of Shri Ved Parkash was not found satisfactory so as per the condition of the appointment letter Ex. M-1, his services were terminated by the respondent management,—vide Ex. M-2, and the workman was given his full and final accounts,—vide Ex. M-3, which bear his signatures. Now no dispute or claim was due of the workman.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from absence of the workman in the proceeding. I feel that the service of the workman were terminated by the respondent as per the condition of appointment letter and the workman was given his full and final account. In this circumstances, I hold that the termination of services of the workman is proper justified and in order and he is not entitled to any relief. No order as to costs.

This be read in answer to this reference.

The 23rd February, 1981

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 456, dated 25th February, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that receipt of the award may please be sent to the court within week's time.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

H. L. GUGNANI, Comm. and Secy.

#### PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

#### BUILDING AND ROAD BRANCH

Jind Circle

The 30th April, 1981

No. 324.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied that land below is needed by the Government at public expense, for a public purpose namely Constructing a road from village Sulhera to Kanheri, Tehsil Narwana Tohana, District Jind/Hissar. It is therefore, hereby, declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the afore said purpose.

This declaration is made under the provisions of Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to to all whom it may be concern and under the provisions of section-7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition collector, Haryana P. W. D. B & R Branch, Ambala Cantt, is hereby directed to take order for the Acquisition of the said land.

Plans of land may be inspected in the offices of the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana PWD B and R Branch, Ambala Cantt, and Executive Engineer Provisional Division Narwana.

#### SPECIFICATION

Distt.	Tehsil	Locality Vill. and Hadbast.	Area in acres	Rectangle/ Killa No.
Jind	Narawna	Sulhera H.B. No. 63	2.62	14
				22, 23, 24, 25/2/2
				15
				11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25

Distt.	Tehsil	Locality/ Vill. and Hdbast.	Area in acres	Rectangle/Ki'a No
Jind	Narwana	Sulhera H. B. No. 63	2.62	<div>16</div> <div>11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 17, 18, 19/1/1</div> <div>16</div> <div>19/1/2, 19/2, 20</div> <div>17</div> <div>11, 12, 13/1, 13/2 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20</div> <div>18</div> <div>16, 17, 18/1, 18/2, 19, 20</div> <div>19</div> <div>24</div> <div>11, 16</div> <div>25</div> <div>5/1, 5/2</div> <div>26</div> <div>1, 3/1 3/2, 4, 5</div> <div>1, 2, 3</div> <div>79, 80, 89, 105, 240/1, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 293, 330, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 355, 367, 369, 372.</div>
Jind	Narwana	Klawar H.B. 61	0.92	<div>383</div> <div>11, 12, 13, 14/1, 14/2, 15/1, 15/2, 16, 17 1,</div> <div>383</div> <div>17/2, 18</div> <div>384</div> <div>11, 20</div>
Hissar	Tohana	Kanheri H.B. No. 93	2.54	<div>38</div> <div>22/1, 22/2, 23/1, 23/2, 24, 25</div> <div>39</div> <div>4/1, 4/2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 20</div> <div>40</div> <div>1, 7, 8, 9, 2, 9/1, 10, 13, 14, 15/1, 15/2</div> <div>41</div> <div>11, 12, 16, 17, 18/1, 18/2, 19, 20, 24, 25</div> <div>42</div> <div>21/1, 21/2, 22, 23</div> <div>44</div> <div>1, 7, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 13, 14, 15/1, 15/2</div> <div>45</div> <div>2, 3/1, 3/2, 4/1, 4/2, 4/3, 5, 6</div> <div>118/1, 122, 126, 128, 131, 159, 175, 178, 473, 476.</div>